



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,275	12/05/2003	Tim Hellman	SDV-001B	1607

21323 7590 12/13/2005

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

RAHMJOO, MANUCHER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2676

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/729,275

Applicant(s)

HELLMAN, TIM

Examiner

Mike Rahmjoo

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2 and 4-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LINZER et al, US Patent Application Publication, Pub., No. US 2004/0100577.

As per claims 1 and 9, as to the broadest reasonable interpretation by examiner, LINZER et al teaches decomposing pixel image data into multiple color space components (section 0043), and storing and retrieving (see paragraph [0051] as corresponding to fetching) the multiple color space components in one continuous machine-readable memory segment in a machine readable memory (see section 0042 - "Cb and co- located Cr pixels may be stored adjacent to each other"), the machine readable memory having one or more burst boundaries (section 0042 also discloses more than one burst boundary).

As per claim 2, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 1, including, wherein the machine-readable memory comprises volatile memory (SDRAM is analogous to volatile

Art Unit: 2676

memory - see sections 0006, 0008 and 0033).

As per claim 4, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 2, including, wherein the volatile memory comprises static random memory (see sections 0006, 0008 and 0033)

As per claim 5, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 1, including, wherein the colorspace components comprise luminance, red difference sample, and blue difference sample see (section 0042)

As per claim 7, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 1, including, wherein the pixel image data comprises a first data byte (section 0007), the first data byte being registered at a memory address immediately following one of the one or more burst boundaries (see section 0007 and section 0054 matches the address means with the burst means for the at least one burst boundary).

As per claim 8, of claim 1 wherein the pixel image data comprises a first data byte and subsequent data bytes (see section 0007), one of the subsequent data bytes being registered at a memory address immediately following one of the one or more burst boundaries (see section 0007 and section 0054 matches the address means with the burst means for the at least one burst boundary).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LINZER et.al, US Patent Application Publication, Pub. No. US 2004/0100577 in view of BALKRISHNAN et al, US Patent No. 6,028,612.

As per claim 3, LINZER et al meet limitations of claim 2, however, does not expressly teach use of dynamic random access memory (DRAM). BALAKRISHNAN teaches the above feature (col 8, lines 3-23).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the DRAM processing means because "...the delay of the burst is fixed -(see col 8, lines 15-23)" and provides results in "minimizing the memory bandwidth consumed by the overall decoding process - see col 8, lines 21-23) of BALAKRISHNAN et al to modify the memory for video storing data taught by LINZER et al because both inventions share similar technological environments and share similar problems, i.e., better utilization of bandwidth, and modification with the teaching of BALAKRISHNAN et al reduces bandwidth requirements.

As per claims 6 and 14, LINZER et al meet limitations of claims land 9, LINZER et al teach wherein the color space components comprise a red color level, and a blue color level (see section 0042), however, does not expressly teach a green color level. BALAKRISHNAN et al teach the above feature (see col 10, lines 5-14 and col 11, lines 7-16).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the features for "minimizing the memory bandwidth consumed by the overall decoding process - see col 8, lines 21-23)" of BALAKRISHNAN et al to modify the

memory for video storing data taught by LINZER et al because both inventions share similar technological environments and share similar problems, i.e., better utilization of bandwidth, and modification with the teaching of BALAKRISHNAN et al reduces bandwidth requirements.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's remarks on page 5, applicant argues "the memory controller means in Linzer et al is not analogous to the machine readable memory as claimed".

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As to the broadest reasonable interpretation by examiner, Linzer teaches continuous machine readable memory segment (i.e., fig. 5A memory 142 or 144 broadly corresponding to continuous machine readable memory segment) and storing pixel data see for example the abstract, page 2 paragraph [0020], page 4 paragraph [0042], fig. 2 and 4- 5. Said data is generally represented by three rectangular matrices of pixel data, luminance (e.g., luma or Y) and two chrominance values (e.g., chroma Cb and Cr) corresponding to multiple color space components, wherein said components correspond to a decomposed representation of the three primary colors associated with each picture element (or pixel). As to examiner's broad interpreting, the decomposed representation of the three primary colors also correspond to the applicant's color space components.

As per applicant's remarks on page 6, applicant argues "the multiple color space components are NOT located in one continuous machine readable memory segment".

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner fails to see said language as being claimed which corresponds to the locations of the "multiple color space components". In light of the response provided earlier, Linzer et al teaches "the first storage device (a continuous machine readable memory segment) may be configured to store at least one first pixel from a first field of a frame of the image at a first physical address in the first storage device" see for example the abstract, page 2 paragraph [0020], fig. 2 and 4- 5.

In response to retrieving pixel image data, examiner points out to page 6 paragraph [0051] wherein examiner broadly interprets fetching of pixel data from either memory 142 or 144 and the two of them combined (as a single unified memory since the addresses used for both memories are identical) as corresponding to the retrieving pixel image data as claimed by applicant.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2676

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Rahmjoo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7789. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30- 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (571) 272- 7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273- 8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Mike Rahmjoo

December 2, 2005



**MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**